UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,407	08/17/2000	Hamish D.S. Martin	3Com-76 (3106NMDUSP)	4674

7265 7590 11/20/2003

MICHAELSON AND WALLACE
PARKWAY 109 OFFICE CENTER
328 NEWMAN SPRINGS RD
P O BOX 8489
RED BANK, NJ 07701

EXAMINER	
ORTIZ, XIOMARA Y	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	5

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/641,407	Applicant(s) MARTIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Xiomara Y. Ortiz	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 August 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *4* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/2/2001 was filed after the mailing date of the application on 08/17/2000. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosbab U.S Patent No. 5917808 in view of Diebboll U.S. Patent No. 5886643 in further view of McKee U.S. Patent No. 5712981.

Regarding claim 1, Kosbab discloses a method for identifying devices on a local area network (Ethernet) using passive monitoring. This method, includes receiving network traffic in form of frames, see col.4 lines 46-47. It is well known in the art that the Ethernet frame contain information about the destination, source, type of protocol used, etc. In addition to the

mentioned information, information of the frame count, is received, see col.5 lines 14-15. Kosbab also disclose a method that compares the frame type information with server frame type wherein this means identifying data to one or more protocols in order to identify a server, see col. 8 lines 16-20. Kosbab complies with the limitations on claim 1 which includes receiving data containing source device, destination device, data transfer protocol, and volume of information.

But Kosbab fails to disclose to determine as a server the device with the highest data volume for communications in which is the source or destination device.

However Diebboll teaches an method and apparatus for discovering network topology in which explains that a network manager can ask the system to identify all of the servers that a particular node is talking to, identify all of the traffic between two identified nodes, and also protocols that are being used over the particular line. These additional data is stores in a database in storage where each one is associated between a particular source-destination node pair, see col.5 lines 25-33. A server in a client server/ configuration receives a request from a client and supplies files or services to the client. When the server receives the request is acting as a destination device and when supplies files or services is acting as a source. It is well known in the art that a server due to the traffic of receiving request and providing services and/or files is the device with highest traffic in the network. Diebboll also teaches, identifying the probe with the highest total count, see col.8 lines 8-11. Diebboll also complies with part of the limitations in claim 1 which include that the server is either the source or destination device and that the device has the highest data volume.

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above invention suggested by Kosbab and combining it with the invention disclosed by Diebboll. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this combination in order to have a more precise method to identify servers. Kosbab teaches that frames contain information that may be uniquely associated with specific type of network device, but gives an example to identify a router and it says that frames containing router information protocol messages "may" be assumed to be generated by one or more routers, see Kosbab col.3 lines 5-10.

The combination of Kosbab and Diebboll discloses all the limitations above but fails to disclose to determine that the communication involve at least a threshold number of other devices.

However McKee discloses a network analysis for identify global and local node servers in where explains that identifying a local server with the highest linkage where the linkage of a node with other nodes are measured in terms of at least number of associated nodes, number of frames involved in the traffic, or number of bytes involved in the traffic, see col.2 lines 7-20. McKee complies with the limitation in claim one of identify the device, which involve at least a threshold number of other devices.

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above invention suggested by Kosbab and combining it with the invention disclosed by McKee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this combination in order to have a more precise method to identify servers. Kosbab teaches that frames contain information that may be uniquely associated with specific

type of network device, but gives an example to identify a router and it says that frames containing router information protocol messages "may" be assumed to be generated by one or more routers, see Kosbab col.3 lines 5-10.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Kosbab, Diebboll, and McKee discloses all the limitations in claim 1 and also a method to identify data related to server protocols, which comprises comparing the frame information (protocols) to server frame types and if there is a match between the frame information and any of the server frame type, identify entry as a server, see Kosbab col. 8 lines 16-41.

Regarding claim 3, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 2, and also teaches, that after comparing the frame information with the server frame type, and having a match, the corresponding entry is tagged as a server, see Kosbab col.8 lines 36-41.

Regarding claim 4, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 1, and also discloses identifying global and local servers depending on the depth of the detail provided by the traffic data. The traffic data can be simply based on source and destination node address of message packets passed across the network, see McKee col.7 lines 6-14. In addition, determine the total counts for all the identified probes in where that probe is the one with the best data about the conversation between the selected source-destination node pair, see Diebboll col.8 lines 8-13.

Regarding claim 5, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 4, and also disclose that after the total count have been computed for al the identified probes, the network management system identifies the probe with the highest total count, see Diebboll col.5 lines 8-11.

Regarding claim 6, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 5, and also discloses determining the number and types of devices that are present in the LAN for purpose of maintenance and troubleshooting, see Kosbab col.2 lines 21-23.

Regarding claim 10, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 1, and receiving data of the network traffic in form of frames, see Kosbab col.4 lines46-47.

Regarding claim 11, the combination disclose all the limitations in claim 10, and also collecting frame information with a test instrument connected to the LAN, see col. 3 lines 33-36, where the network device determine the types of devices on a LAN by passively monitoring network traffic, see Kosbab col.3 lines 44-46.

Regarding claim 12, the combination disclose all the limitations in claim 11, and that the data is collected over a predetermined period of time desired by the user of the test instrument, see Kosbab col. 7 lines 13-16.

Regarding claim 13, discloses all the limitations in claim 11, where the network data is RMON 2 data. RMON 2 is a specifies protocol for communicating with the probe and it specifies the format of the Management Information Base (MIB), see Diebboll col.4 lines 38-42. The RMON collects 9 kinds of information including packet sent, bytes sent, packet dropped, statistic by host, conversation between two address, and other events that occur. The probe used is a program or other device inserted at a key junction in a network for the purpose of monitoring or collecting data about the network activity.

Regarding claim 14, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 1 and by definition of network that is a group of computers and associated devices that are connected by

communication facilities, the threshold number, that is the number of other devices, is grater than one.

Regarding claim 15, the combination discloses, all the limitations in claim 1 and also disclose relevant server protocols as TCP/IP BOOTP, TCP/IP DNS, TCP/IP WINS, TCP/IP DHCP, IPX SAP, IPX, and Net BIOS, Kosbab see col.8 lines 20-33.

4. Claims 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosbab U.S Patent No. 5917808 in view of Diebboll U.S. Patent No. 5886643 in further view of McKee U.S Patent No. 5712981.

Regarding claim 16, Kosbab discloses a method for identifying device types on a local area network (Ethernet) using passive monitoring using a test device. Such test device containing a frame processor that can be implemented in hardware, software, or a combination thereof, see fig.3 and col.4 lines 54-56. The frame processor in the test instrument receives frames on the network using the TCP/IP protocol. Such frames, contains information of source, destination, and type of data (protocol), provided in the Ethernet frame, and the frame count, see col.5 line 14. The frame information, as it arrives, is compared against sets of frame types, which each type is uniquely associated with one of the network device types (protocols), see col.3 lines 18-24. Such information can be used to determine a device as a server, see col. 5 lines 59-63. Kosbab complies with some of the limitations in claim 16, which includes a frame processor which can be implemented in software, that receives data containing source device, destination device, data transfer protocol, and frame count or volume of information, and that the software is for identifying data relating to one or more relevant server protocols or frame types.

But Kosbab fails to disclose a software to determine as a server, the device with the highest data volume for communications in which is the source or destination device.

However Diebboll teaches an algorithm that can be a computer program cause is implemented on a apparatus, in which identify all source-destination node pairs for which the conversation have been recorder and identify the probe that produces the highest count, see fig.4. A server in a client server/ configuration receives a request from a client and supplies files or services to the client. When the server receives the request is acting as a destination device and when supplies files or services is acting as a source. It is well known in the art that a server due to the traffic of receiving request and providing services and/or files is the device with highest traffic in the network. Diebboll also complies with part of the limitations in claim 16 which include a software for identify that the server is either the source or destination device and that determines the device with the highest data volume.

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above invention suggested by Kosbab and combining it with the invention disclosed by Diebboll. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this combination in order to have a more precise method to identify servers. Kosbab teaches that frames contain information that may be uniquely associated with specific type of network device, but gives an example to identify a router and it says that frames containing router information protocol messages "may" be assumed to be generated by one or more routers, see Kosbab col.3 lines 5-10.

The combination of Kosbab and Diebboll discloses all the limitations above but fails to disclose to determine that the communication involve at least a threshold number of other devices.

However McKee discloses a network analysis for identify global and local node servers in where explains that identifying a local server with the highest linkage where the linkage of a node with other nodes are measured in terms of at least number of associated nodes, number of frames involved in the traffic, or number of bytes involved in the traffic, see col.2 lines 7-20. McKee complies with the limitation in claim one of identify the device, which involve at least a threshold number of other devices.

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above invention suggested by Kosbab and combining it with the invention disclosed by McKee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this combination in order to have a more precise method to identify servers. Kosbab teaches that frames contain information that "may" be uniquely associated with specific type of network device, but gives an example to identify a router and it says that frames containing router information protocol messages may be assumed to be generated by one or more routers, see Kosbab col.3 lines 5-10.

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Kosbab, Diebboll, and McKee discloses all the limitations in claim 16, and also a software which comprises comparing the frame information (protocols) to server frame types and if there is a match between the frame information and any of the server frame type, identify entry as a server, see Kosbab col. 8 lines 16-41.

Regarding claim 18, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 17, and also teaches an algorithm that after identify the probe that produces the highest count, tag all the records for that probe (210), see Diebboll fig. 2.

Regarding claim 19, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 16, and also disclose an algorithm that identifies all source-destination node pair for which conversation has been recorded (200), for the selected one of the identified probes, add up the total normalized packet counts to compute a total count (206), and repeat until the step (206) is done to the rest of the identified probes (208), see Diebboll fig.4.

Regarding claim 20, the combination discloses, all the limitations in claim 19, and also discloses an algorithm that identifies the probe that produces the highest count (210), see Diebboll fig.4

Regarding claim 21, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 20, and also discloses a software in the test instrument to determine the number and types of devices that are present in the LAN, see Kosbab col.2 lines 21-23.

Regarding claim 24, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 16, where at the frame processor of the test instrument can be implemented as software. The frame information is stores in a database, which the database has a table with the source and frame count fields, wherein frame counts means the volume of information, see Kosbab fig.4. But Kosbab fails to disclose the data in the table having the fields of source, destination, application, and volume of data.

However Diebboll et al. discloses that the retrieved data is stored in a database in an external storage, see col.5 line 30-32. Such database includes several fields including the source, destination, the number of packets, and the protocol used, see fig. 2.

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above invention suggested by Kosbab and combining it with the invention disclosed by Diebboll. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this combination in order store in the database the best information about the traffic between two identified nodes, see Diebboll col. 6 lines 26-27. "A network manager can ask the system to identify all of the servers that a particular node is talking to; to identify all of the traffic between two identified nodes; to identify the protocols that are being used over a particular line; etc.", see Diebboll col.5 lines 25-29.

Regarding claim 25, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 24, and also discloses that the network data is RMON 2 data. RMON 2 is a specifies protocol for communicating with the probe and it specifies the format of the Management Information Base (MIB), see Diebboll col.4 lines 38-42. The RMON collects 9 kinds of information including packet sent, bytes sent, packet dropped, statistic by host, conversation between two address, and other events that occur. The probe used is a program or other device inserted at a key junction in a network for the purpose of monitoring or collecting data about the network activity.

5. Claims 26, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosbab U.S Patent No. 5917808 in view of Diebboll et al. U.S. Patent No. 5886643 in further view of McKee U.S. Patent No. 5712981.

Regarding claim 26, Kosbab discloses an apparatus to identify device types on a network comprising of a test instrument with a frame processor connected to the network that collect and receives network traffic in form of frames, see col.3 lines 2-18. Kosbab also discloses that the LAN (Ethernet) is operating according to the TCP/IP protocol. The data in form of frames contain information such as source address and destination address, and data transfer protocol, which is contained in the Ethernet frame. The information also contains frame count, see col.5 line 14. The frame processor uses the frame information and compares it, against set of frame types; where each frame type is uniquely associated with one of the network device type, see col.3 lines 15-25. For identifying data to determine as a server device, the frame information is compared with server frame types, see col.8 lines 16-40. Kosbab comply with the limitations described in claim 26 which includes a network device, as a test instrument, to collect data representing communications on the network (frames) that contain information about the source device, destination device, data transfer protocol, obtain from the Ethernet frame and data volume information (frame count). It also includes a processor for receiving the data for identifying data relating to one or more server protocol (frame type) were such data is used to identify such device as a server.

But Kosbab fails to disclose to determine as a server the device with the highest data volume for communications in which is the source or destination device.

However Diebboll teaches an method and apparatus for discovering network topology in which explains that a network manager can ask the system to identify all of the servers that a particular node is talking to, identify all of the traffic between two identified nodes, and also protocols that are being used over the particular line. These additional data is stores in a database in storage where each one is associated between a particular source-destination node pair, see col.5 lines 25-33. A server in a client server/ configuration receives a request from a client and supplies files or services to the client. When the server receives the request is acting as a destination device and when supplies files or services is acting as a source. It is well known in the art that a server due to the traffic of receiving request and providing services and/or files is the device with highest traffic in the network. Diebboll also teaches, identifying the probe with the highest total count, see col.8 lines 8-11. Diebboll also complies with part of the limitations in claim 1 which include that the server is either the source or destination device and that the device has the highest data volume for communication.

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above invention suggested by Kosbab and combining it with the invention disclosed by Diebboll. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this combination in order to have a more precise method to identify servers. Kosbab teaches that frames contain information that may be uniquely associated with specific type of network device, but gives an example to identify a router and it says that frames containing router information protocol messages "may" be assumed to be generated by one or more routers, see Kosbab col.3 lines 5-10.

The combination of Kosbab and Diebboll discloses all the limitations above but fails to disclose to determine that the communication involve at least a threshold number of other devices.

However McKee discloses a network analysis for identify global and local node servers in where explains that identifying a local server with the highest linkage where the linkage of a node with other nodes are measured in terms of at least number of associated nodes, number of frames involved in the traffic, or number of bytes involved in the traffic, see col.2 lines 7-20. McKee complies with the limitation in claim one of identify the device, which involve at least a threshold number of other devices.

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above invention suggested by Kosbab and combining it with the invention disclosed by McKee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this combination in order to have a more precise method to identify servers. Kosbab teaches that frames contain information that may be uniquely associated with specific type of network device, but gives an example to identify a router and it says that frames containing router information protocol messages "may" be assumed to be generated by one or more routers, see Kosbab col.3 lines 5-10.

Regarding claim 27, the combination of Kosbab, Diebboll, and McKee disclose al the limitations in claim 26, and also discloses a pictorial representation of the stations database, where the table present in form of a table the network address, Mac address device name, the frame count, error count, and node type, see fig. 4. Kosbab also discloses that the fields are defined according to the preferred embodiment for storing information gathered from the

network devices, see col.5 lines 6-8. But Kosbab fails to disclose the data in the table having the fields of source, destination, application, and volume of data.

However Diebboll et al. discloses a method and apparatus for discovering network topology in which teaches that the retrieved data is stored in a database in an external storage, see col.5 line 30-32. Such database includes several fields including the source, destination, the number of packets, and the protocol used, see fig. 2.

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above invention suggested by Kosbab and combining it with the invention disclosed by Diebboll et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this combination in order store in the database the best information about the traffic between two identified nodes, see col. 6 lines26-26. "A network manager can ask the system to identify all of the servers that a particular node is talking to; to identify all of the traffic between two identified nodes; to identify the protocols that are being used over a particular line; etc.", see col.5 lines 25-29.

Regarding claim 28, the combination of Kosbab, Diebboll, and McKee disclose al the limitations in claim 26, and also discloses a data storage, as a memory, that comprises a database, see Kosbab fig.3.

6. Claims 7, 8,9,22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosbab U.S Patent No. 5917808 in view of Dieboll U.S. Patent No. 5886643 in further view of McKee U.S Patent No. 5712981 in further view of Maddalozzo Jr. et al. U.S Patent No. 5974460.

Regarding claim 7 and 22, the combination discloses all the limitations in claim 6 and 21, but fails to disclose comparing the determined number of other devices against a predetermines threshold number and if the number exceeds the predetermines threshold number identify the device with the higheststotal volume as a server. However Maddalozzo teaches the method of comparing transfer time with a program, see fig. 5, with a predetermined threshold transfer time. If the transfer time exceeds the predetermine threshold time, then the transfer process is cut short at the predetermined time "Y" and the number of bytes transferred during that time is "remembered" or stored 515 (usually in system memory 207 or cache memory 205), and the process continues to compare 411 the results with the best site results from earlier samples, see col.5 lines 26-36.

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above invention suggested by Kosbab, Diebboll and McKee and combining it with the invention disclosed by Maddalozzo. One way to identify a server is identifying the device with highest total volume, but this device, a server, must have at least one client. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this combination in order to compare the number of devices connected with a threshold number of clients. This method and program, can lead to a more precise way of identifying servers. Kosbab teaches that frames contain information that may be uniquely associated with specific type of network device, but gives an example to identify a router and it says that frames containing router information protocol messages “may” be assumed to be generated by one or more routers, see Kosbab col.3 lines 5-10.

Regarding claim 8 and 23, the combination of Kosbab, Diebboll, McKee, and Maddalozzo discloses all the limitations in claim 7 and 22, and also disclose that after the server is added to the local server list, then the server is removed from the active node list and to disable its associate traffic elements, see McKee col.9 lines 15-20.

Regarding claim 9, the combination the combination of Kosbab, Diebboll, McKee, and Maddalozzo discloses all the limitations in claim 8, and also disclose that when the server is identified is removed from the active node list and its associated traffic elements are disabled by resetting of the enable flag in each of the element, see McKee col.8 lines 42-45. The enable flag marks the data and by convention, when the enable flag is set, it is included in the currently relevant traffic data, and when the enable flag is reset, the element is excluded, see McKee col.7 lines 58-64.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a. U.S. Pat. No. 6,263,368 B1 to Martin, which discloses network balancing for multi-computer server by counting message packets to/from multi-computer server.

b. U.S. Pat. No. 6,137,782 to Sharon et al., which discloses an automatic network traffic analysis.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xiomara Y. Ortiz whose telephone number is (703) 305-6783. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM to 5:30PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Xiomara Y. Ortiz
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2141

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER